

Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed .

In the Office Action, the Examiner required restriction of the claims into one of the following inventions:

- I. Claims 1-14 and 39-42 drawn to a method and a corresponding computer readable media for dividing the image into plural planes and compressing accordingly, classified in class 382, subclass 239;
- II. Claims 15-20, 30-33 and 43-47, drawn to a method, an apparatus and a corresponding computer readable media for selecting pixels of the image to be reconstructed from plural plans of data representing the image, classified in class 382, subclass 233; and
- III. Claims 21-29 and 34-35 drawn to an apparatus for dividing the image into plural planes, replacing color in one plane with a selected color, and feeding errors of the replacement, classified in class 382, subclass 167.

The Examiner alleges that the inventions are distinct from each other for reasons discussed in the Office Action.

Pending Claims 36-38 have not been classified by the Examiner in the Office Action. However, based on the Examiner's description of the Applicants' allegedly distinct inventions, the Applicants believe Claims 36-38 are drawn to classification defined for Group II.


Applicants hereby elect to proceed with prosecution on the merits with Group II, Claims 15-20, 30-33 and 43-47 as well as Claims 36-38, which the Applicant believes is drawn to the same class of invention as Group II.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment

to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time which may be required. A duplicate copy of this authorization is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 25, 2001

By: 
Jonathan M. Hollander
Reg. No. P48,717

FLIESLER DUBB MEYER & LOVEJOY LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, Suite 400
San Francisco, California 94111-4156
Telephone: (415) 362-3800